

a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna.

In addition to the features above listed, each of the claims recite unique differences, as identified below:

Claim 11 further recites:

the fiber optic cable has a length, and wherein
the transponder includes information related to the length of the fiber optic cable.

Claim 13 further recites:

the fiber optic connector conforms to an industrial standard, and wherein
the transponder includes information related to the industrial standard to
which the fiber optic connector conforms.

Claim 15 further recites:

the fiber optic cable includes an optical fiber, and wherein
the optical fiber conforms to a predetermined optical fiber grade, and wherein
the transponder includes information related to the predetermined optical fiber
grade of the optical fiber of the fiber optic cable.

Claim 17 further recites:

the fiber optic cable was purchased on a specific date, and wherein
the transponder includes information related to the specific purchase date
of the fiber optic cable.

Claim 19 further recites:

the fiber optic cable was purchased pursuant to a warranty, and wherein

the transponder includes information related to the warranty.

Claims 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzoni.

Each claim is addressed in turn below.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzoni.

Stanescu was cited for disclosing every feature of Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 11 except for "fiber length." The Stanescu reference fails to disclose the length of an optical fiber, and the inclusion of that information in a transponder. Thus, the Stanescu reference lacks the claimed features of "the fiber optic cable has a length," and wherein "the transponder includes information related to the length of the optical cable," as recited in Claim 11. Therefore, the Stanescu reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 11.

Renzoni discloses a spooling device for an optical fiber jump cable. The spooling device includes an optical fiber having respective connectors at each end of the optical fiber. The Office Action notes that col. 4, lines 40-44, of Renzoni discloses that "the spooling device can be labeled as to its contents, for example, connector types, fiber type, fiber length, purchase date, serial number, and other pertinent information to assist the user in selecting the appropriate optical fiber jumper cable stored in the device." The Renzoni reference fails to disclose a transponder, a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device, an antenna, a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna, and the transponder having information related

to the length of the fiber optic cable. Thus, the Renzoni reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device,” and “an antenna attached to the substrate,” and “a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the length of the fiber optic cable,” as recited in Claim 11. Therefore, the Renzoni reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 11.

Renzoni was cited in combination with Stanescu for rendering obvious the claimed invention. However, the Renzoni reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Stanescu in regard to Claim 11. Thus, Claim 11 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

However, the Office Action takes the position set forth below:

In view of Rezoni's information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known connector type information (claim 13), fiber length (claim 11) and purchase date (claim 17) in the transponder tag and communication system of Stanescu because as Rezoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data in putting together a good fiber network. Connectors must match, fiber length must be compensated for by necessary amplification, and purchase date indicates how old the fiber is.

The Office Action asserts that “Renzoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data;” however, the Renzoni reference fails to provide the teaching or motivation to impart with the transponder the information related to the length of the fiber optical cable. The Office Action does not set forth or cite the source for the motivation to combine references as set forth in MPEP sections 2142, and 2143. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejection of Claim 11 should be removed, and that Claim 11 should be allowed.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzoni.

Stanescu was cited for disclosing every feature of Applicants’ invention as recited in Claim 13 except for “connector type.” The Stanescu reference fails to disclose the industrial standard to which the fiber optic connector conforms, and the inclusion of that information in a transponder. Thus, the Stanescu reference lacks the claimed features of “the fiber optic connector conforms to an industrial standard,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the industrial standard to which the fiber optic connector conforms,” as recited in Claim 13. Therefore, the Stanescu reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 13.

Renzoni discloses a spooling device for an optical fiber jump cable. The spooling device includes an optical fiber having respective connectors at each end of the optical fiber. The Office Action notes that col. 4, lines 40-44, of Renzoni discloses that “the spooling device can be labeled as to its contents, for example, connector types, fiber type, fiber length, purchase date, serial number, and other pertinent information to assist the user in selecting the appropriate optical fiber jumper cable stored in the device.” The Renzoni reference fails to disclose a

transponder, a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device, an antenna, a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna, and the transponder having information related to the industrial standard to which the fiber optic connector conforms. Thus, the Renzoni reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device,” and “an antenna attached to the substrate,” and “a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the industrial standard to which the fiber optic connector conforms,” as recited in Claim 13. Therefore, the Renzoni reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 13.

Renzoni was cited in combination with Stanescu for rendering obvious the claimed invention. However, the Renzoni reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Stanescu in regard to Claim 13. Thus, Claim 13 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

However, the Office Action takes the position set forth below:

In view of Rezoni's information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known connector type information (claim 13), fiber length (claim 11) and purchase date (claim 17) in the transponder tag and communication system of Stanescu because as Rezoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data in putting together a good fiber

network. Connectors must match, fiber length must be compensated for by necessary amplification, and purchase date indicates how old the fiber is.

The Office Action asserts that “Renzoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data;” however, the Renzoni reference fails to provide the teaching or motivation to impart with the transponder the information related to the industrial standard to which the fiber optic connector conforms. The Office Action does not set forth or cite the source for the motivation to combine references as set forth in MPEP sections 2142, and 2143. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejection of Claim 13 should be removed, and that Claim 13 should be allowed.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzoni.

Stanescu was cited for disclosing every feature of Applicants’ invention as recited in Claim 15 except for “grade.” The Stanescu reference fails to disclose the grade of the optical fiber, and the inclusion of that information in a transponder. Thus, the Stanescu reference lacks the claimed features of “the fiber optic cable includes an optical fiber, and wherein the optical fiber conforms to a predetermined optical fiber grade,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber of the fiber optic cable,” as recited in Claim 15. Therefore, the Stanescu reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 15.

Renzoni discloses a spooling device for an optical fiber jump cable. The spooling device includes an optical fiber having respective connectors at each end of the optical fiber. The Office Action notes that col. 4, lines 40-44, of Renzoni discloses that “the spooling device can be

labeled as to its contents, for example, connector types, fiber type, fiber length, purchase date, serial number, and other pertinent information to assist the user in selecting the appropriate optical fiber jumper cable stored in the device.” The Renzone reference fails to disclose a transponder, a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device, an antenna, a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna, and the transponder having information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber. Thus, the Renzone reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device,” and “an antenna attached to the substrate,” and “a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber of the fiber optic cable,” as recited in Claim 15. Therefore, the Renzone reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 15.

Stoy was cited for disclosing that “Stoy (US 5,066,091) makes mention (column 14, lines 62-68) of the value of grade matching in replacing fibers in a system.” The Stoy reference does not disclose a transponder having information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber. Thus, the Stoy reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “the transponder includes information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber of the fiber optic cable,” as recited in Claim 15. Therefore, the Stoy reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 15.

Stoy was cited in combination with Stanescu in view of Renzone for rendering obvious the claimed invention. However, the Stoy reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Stanescu in view of Renzone in regard to Claim 15. Thus, Claim 15 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

Additionally, in regard to the rejection of Claim 15, the Office Action fails to provide the teaching or motivation to impart with the transponder the information related to the predetermined optical fiber grade of the optical fiber of the fiber optic cable. The Office Action does not set forth or cite the source for the motivation to combine references as set forth in MPEP sections 2142, and 2143. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejection of Claim 15 should be removed, and that Claim 15 should be allowed.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzone.

Stanescu was cited for disclosing every feature of Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 17 except for "purchase date." The Stanescu reference fails to disclose the specified date on which the fiber optic cable was purchased, and the inclusion of that information in a transponder. Thus, the Stanescu reference lacks the claimed features of "the fiber optic cable was purchased on a specified date," and wherein "the transponder includes information related to the specific purchase date of the fiber optic cable," as recited in Claim 17. Therefore, the Stanescu reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 17.

Renzone discloses a spooling device for an optical fiber jump cable. The spooling device includes an optical fiber having respective connectors at each end of the optical fiber. The

Office Action notes that col. 4, lines 40-44, of Renzoni discloses that “the spooling device can be labeled as to its contents, for example, connector types, fiber type, fiber length, purchase date, serial number, and other pertinent information to assist the user in selecting the appropriate optical fiber jumper cable stored in the device.” The Renzoni reference fails to disclose a transponder, a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device, an antenna, a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna, and the transponder having information related to the specific purchase date of the fiber optic cable. Thus, the Renzoni reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device,” and “an antenna attached to the substrate,” and “a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the specific purchase date of the fiber optic cable,” as recited in Claim 17. Therefore, the Renzoni reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 17.

Renzoni was cited in combination with Stanescu for rendering obvious the claimed invention. However, the Renzoni reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Stanescu in regard to Claim 17. Thus, Claim 17 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

However, the Office Action takes the position set forth below:

In view of Renzoni's information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known connector type information (claim 13),

fiber length (claim 11) and purchase date (claim 17) in the transponder tag and communication system of Stanescu because as Renzoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data in putting together a good fiber network. Connectors must match, fiber length must be compensated for by necessary amplification, and purchase date indicates how old the fiber is.

The Office Action asserts that “Renzoni clearly recognizes, these are all relevant data;” however, the Renzoni reference fails to provide the teaching or motivation to impart with the transponder the information related to the specific purchase date of the fiber optic cable. The Office Action does not set forth or cite the source for the motivation to combine references as set forth in MPEP sections 2142, and 2143. Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejection of Claim 17 should be removed, and that Claim 17 should be allowed.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanescu in view of Renzoni.

Stanescu was cited for disclosing every feature of Applicants’ invention as recited in Claim 19 except for “warranty.” The Stanescu reference fails to disclose the warranty associated with the fiber optic cable, and the inclusion of that information in a transponder. Thus, the Stanescu reference lacks the claimed features of “the fiber optic cable was purchased pursuant to a warranty,” and wherein “transponder includes information related to the warranty,” as recited in Claim 19. Therefore, the Stanescu reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 19.

Renzoni discloses a spooling device for an optical fiber jump cable. The spooling device includes an optical fiber having respective connectors at each end of the optical fiber. The Office Action notes that col. 4, lines 40-44, of Renzoni discloses that “the spooling device can be labeled as to its contents, for example, connector types, fiber type, fiber length, purchase date, serial number, and other pertinent information to assist the user in selecting the appropriate optical fiber jumper cable stored in the device.” The Renzoni reference fails to disclose a transponder, a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device, an antenna, a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna, and the transponder having information related to the warranty of the fiber optic cable. Thus, the Renzoni reference lacks the claimed features of “a transponder attached to the fiber optic connector,” and “a substrate adapted for attachment to a panel of a host device,” and “an antenna attached to the substrate,” and “a transceiver electrically connected to the antenna so as to form a reader which is capable of activating and interrogating the transponder when the transponder is sufficiently close to the antenna,” and wherein “the fiber optic cable was purchased pursuant to a warranty,” and wherein “the transponder includes information related to the warranty,” as recited in Claim 19. Therefore, the Renzoni reference is not believed to in any way anticipate or render obvious the present invention as recited in Claim 19.

Renzoni was cited in combination with Stanescu for rendering obvious the claimed invention. However, the Renzoni reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Stanescu in regard to Claim 19. Thus, Claim 19 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

However, the Office Action takes the position set forth below:

Warranty information is also understood in the art to be useful
when maintaining a fiber optic network because if a fiber in the
network is under warranty, it might be possible to recoup its costs.

The Office Action does not set forth or cite the source for the motivation to combine references
as set forth in MPEP sections 2142, and 2143. Also, the Office Action does not cite a reference
for the claim feature of a "warranty," as set forth in MPEP section 2143.03. Therefore,
Applicants believe that the rejection of Claim 19 should be removed, and that Claim 19 should
be allowed.

Filed herewith is an INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT, form PTO-1449,
and a copy of the listed reference.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are
definite and in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is therefore
respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date of Deposit: *June 9, 2005*

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service via first class mail
on the date indicated above and is addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Karl D. Kovach

By *Karl D. Kovach*
Karl D. Kovach
Reg. No.: 40,278
Stratos International, Inc.
Attorney for Applicants
7444 West Wilson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60706
(708) 867-9600